

REMARKS

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter; (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

By the present response, Applicants have amended claim 5 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-5 and 10-12 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claim 5 has been objected to for informalities. Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,324,522 (Peterson et al.). Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,085,171 (Leonard et al.). Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,915 (Kirsch).

Response to Arguments

In the Response to Arguments section on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Applicants' arguments filed March 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants question whether Applicants' previously filed arguments have been fully considered. For example, the Examiner fails to address Applicants' arguments that none of the cited references disclose or suggest the database server configured to store information relating to order errors, or an order control server configured to gather in all information about the respective order error items stored in the database server, and to determine whether the error of the corresponding order is correct, and to execute a selective order control in accordance with the determination, as mentioned on page 10 of Applicants' previously filed Response. Further, regarding claim 10, the Examiner asserts that "it is noted that the features upon which Applicant relies (i.e., order restriction information of a plurality of products) are not recited in the rejected claims". However, these limitations are clearly recited in claim 10, lines 3 and 4. Specifically, claim 10 recites a database server configured to store information about a plurality of dealing companies, credit information for each of the plurality of dealing companies, and order restriction information of a plurality of products. Applicant respectfully request that Examiner to address each of Applicants' arguments and each limitation in the claims of the present application.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended this claim to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Petersen et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner again asserts that Petersen et al. discloses a database server configured to store information about a plurality of dealing companies, credit information for each of a plurality of dealing companies, and order restriction information of a plurality of products, at col. 41, lines 51-61, and figures 13-16. However, as noted previously, these portions merely disclose details regarding the electronic commerce function for vendors that enable vendors to be able to upload their data files to the database server and to maintain a download directory of orders, quotes and notes that the vendors will be downloading, as well as allowing the vendors to purge out files that they have already downloaded. These portions do not disclose or suggest a database server configured to store information about a plurality of dealing companies, credit information for each of the plurality of dealing companies, and order restriction information of a plurality of products, as recited in the claims of the present application. Petersen et al. merely discloses that via an electronic commerce function, a vendor can upload and download data files. These portions do not disclose or suggest anything related to a database server storing credit information for dealing companies and order restriction information of a plurality of products.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Petersen et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of claim 10 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen et al. in view of Leonard et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim. For example, the Examiner again asserts that Petersen et al. discloses that an information acquisition server coupled to the database server and configured to acquire information about each of the plurality of dealing companies and to register the acquired information on the database server, by figure 11. Applicants are confused by the Examiner's assertion. As noted previously, figure 11 discloses a flowchart detailing a download function of the information network that enables off-line access to network information. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to an information acquisition server. According to the limitations in the claims of the present application, an acquisition sever is coupled to the database server. Clearly, Petersen et al. does not disclose or suggest a flowchart (figure 11) coupled to a database server. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to specifically point out where the structure disclosed in Applicants' claims is allegedly disclosed or suggested in the asserted references. Further, figure 11 in Petersen et al. does not disclose or

Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2006

suggest acquiring information about each of the plurality of dealing companies and registering the acquired information on the database server, as recited in the claims of the present application.

The Examiner admits that Peterson et al. does not disclose or suggest the database server configured to store information relating to order errors, or an order control server configured to gather information about the respective order error items stored in the database server, and to determine whether the error of the corresponding order is correct, and to execute a selective order control in accordance with the determination, but asserts that Leonard discloses these limitations in col. 1, lines 39-45, col. 2, lines 16-24 and Figure 5. However, as noted previously, these portions merely disclose that a connection between an agent and a server is used to check for many of the commonly encountered errors in order data, to submit orders electronically, and update the agents order entry software, and that the connection allows the server to quickly communicate errors that it detects in the orders to the client for correction. However, this is not a database server configured to store information relating to product order errors, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, these portions do not disclose or suggest an order control server configured to gather information about respective product order error items noted in the database server, or execute a selective order control in accordance with determining whether an error of corresponding product order is correct. Leonard relates to processing an order to change communication service. Leonard does not disclose or suggest anything related

to an order or product order error. Leonard is directed to allowing a client to change a service, specifically a communication service.

Regarding claims 2-5, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-5 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. in view of Kirsch. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on independent claim 10 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Kirsch does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Peterson et al.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obviously the limitations in the combination of each of claims 11 and 12 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **09/998,412**
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2006

Docket No. **K-0345**

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-5 and 10-12 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



John C. Eisenhart
Registration No. 38,128
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 JCE:FDB/knv
Date: July 19, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2016\2016-076\95508.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer No. 34610